

# 2005-2006 SES EVALUATION REPORT

## DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

**PROVIDER NAME:** **IN Learning Systems (Sylvan)**

**DISTRICTS SERVED:** **MSD Perry Township**

**# OF STUDENTS ENROLLED:** **22 (Reading); 18 (Math)**  
**# OF STUDENTS COMPLETED:** **13 (Reading); 11 (Math)**

**GRADES:** **K-12**

**TYPE OF DELIVERY:** **Small group instruction**

**DESCRIPTION:** See <http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/detail-vendor2.cfm?recordID=0033>

**STUDENT/TEACHER RATIO:** **3/1**

## CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

### PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 46.15%

Overall score: 3.83/4.0

### DISTRICT REPORT

% of districts served reporting: 100% (1/1)

District recommends continuation?: Y (1/1 district served)

### PRINCIPAL REPORT

% of principals reporting: 66.67%

Overall Score: 2.83/4.0

**CUSTOMER SATISFACTION GRADE: **B+****

## SERVICE DELIVERY

### PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 46.15%

Overall score: 3.67/4.0

**DISTRICT REPORT:**

% of districts reporting:	100% (1/1)
Overall score:	100% (16/16 possible points)

**PRINCIPAL REPORT:**

% of principals reporting:	66.67%
Overall score:	2.75/4.0

<b>ONSITE MONITORING/COMPLIANCE:</b>	4.0/4.0
--------------------------------------	---------

<b>SERVICE DELIVERY GRADE:</b>	<b>A-</b>
--------------------------------	-----------

**ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS**

<b>COMPLETION RATE:</b>	60.00%
-------------------------	--------

<b>% OF STUDENTS MEETING GOALS (OF THOSE WHO COMPLETED):</b>	69.23% (Reading) 72.73% (Math)
--	-----------------------------------

<b>TYPE OF ASSESSMENT USED BY PROVIDER:</b>	CAT5
---	------

<b>% OF STUDENTS SHOWING GAINS (BASED ON 100% SAMPLE REPORTED):</b>	92% (Reading); 72.7% (Math);
---	------------------------------

<b>AVERAGE GAIN:</b>	+1.26 (Reading); +1.01 (Math)
----------------------	-------------------------------

<b>% CHANGE IN PRE/POST ASSESSMENT:</b>	+43.16% (Reading); +30.08% (Math);
---	------------------------------------

<b>% OF STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED 80% OR MORE SESSIONS:</b>	100.00%
---	---------

**ISTEP+ DATA (included in academic effectiveness grade):**

For each provider, the ISTEP+ scale scores for each student who participated in SES were analyzed for 2005 and 2006 in English/Language Arts and Math. Only students who completed 80% of their programs and had ISTEP+ scores for both years were included in the analysis.

<b># OF STUDENTS COMPLETING 80% OR MORE SESSIONS:</b>	13 (Math); 16 (E/LA)
(only students completing 80% of provider sessions are included in this analysis)	

## SES STUDENTS ONLY: ISTEP+ RESULTS

For the students served by IN Learning Systems in 2005-2006 who met the criteria described above, ISTEP+ scores grew an average of 20 points for Mathematics and 19 points for English/Language Arts. 90% showed any growth in Mathematics, and 82% showed any growth in English/Language Arts. 60% of the students served showed one year's worth of growth on ISTEP+ scale score for Mathematics, while 36% showed such growth in English/Language Arts. The percentage of students passing ISTEP+ in Mathematics grew by 20 percentage points, while the percentage passing ISTEP+ in English/Language Arts grew by 10 percentage points.

**# OF ELIGIBLE STUDENTS:** 10 (Math); 11 (E/LA)  
(of students completing 80% of the sessions, only those having ISTEP+ scores for both 2005 and 2006 were included in this analysis)

**CHANGE:** +19.6 (Math) +18.9 (E/LA)

**% SHOWING GROWTH ON ISTEP+ SCALE SCORE:** 90% (Math) 82% (E/LA)

**% SHOWING 1 YEAR'S GROWTH ON ISTEP+ SCALE SCORE:** 60% (Math) 36% (E/LA)

**% PASSING ISTEP+ (2005):** 50% (Math) 45% (E/LA)

**% PASSING ISTEP+ (2006):** 70% (Math) 55% (E/LA)

## SES AND NON-SES STUDENTS MATCHED: ISTEP+ RESULTS

### MATHEMATICS

Where possible, each student who participated in SES was matched with a similar student who did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2005 ISTEP+ scale score. The chart below provides the results of the match comparison that demonstrates how the ISTEP+ scores and scale score growth of students who participated in SES compare to similar students who did not participate in SES. For IN Learning Systems, 8 matches out of 10 eligible students (80%) were found for Mathematics. For the group who participated in SES, 88% showed any growth on ISTEP+, compared to 100% of those who did not participate in SES. The same percentage (63%) of SES and non-SES students showed one year's worth of growth. The SES group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 23 points, while the non-participating matched group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 25 points.

MATHEMATICS						
Students	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2006)
SES	8	80%	88%	63%	23	100%
Non-SES	8	80%	100%	63%	25	75%

## ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS

Where possible, each student who participated in SES was matched with a similar student who did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2005 ISTEP+ scale score. The chart below provides the results of the match comparison that demonstrates how the ISTEP+ scores and scale score growth of students who participated in SES compare to similar students who did not participate in SES. For IN Learning Systems, 10 matches out of 10 eligible students (100%) were found for English/Language Arts. For the group who participated in SES, 80% showed any growth on ISTEP+, compared to 70% of non-participating students. However, 30% of the students who participated in SES showed one year's growth on ISTEP+, compared to 60% of the students who did not participate in SES. The SES group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 16 points, while the non-participating matched group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 25 points.

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS						
Students	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2006)
SES	10	90.9%	80%	30%	16	60%
Non-SES	10	90.9%	70%	60%	25	60%

**ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS GRADE:      **B****

**OVERALL GRADE:      **B+****